

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are cancelled. Claims 8-14 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claim 14 has been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). The Office Action asserts that "the detection circuit that detects a power supply voltage supplied or a current supply supplied to the backlight section must be shown..."

However, Fig. 3 clearly shows a detection circuit 4c which, as page 21 lines 9-12 of the specification describes, detects "a voltage of the fluorescent tube 14d". (See also pg.18 11.1-8.)

Applicants therefore submit that the drawings are in full compliance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

The Examiner contends that "recitation of 'detection circuit for detecting... the power supply voltage supplied to said backlight section' is not found clearly supported in the specification." However, as noted above, page 21 lines 9-12 of the specification clearly supports this feature.

Applicants also respectfully point out that, as M.P.E.P. § 2163.02 set forth, "[t]he subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*)

in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement." (Emphasis in the original.)

Applicants therefore submit that claims 8-14 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 8-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been amended to correct the informality.

Applicants therefore submit that claims 8-14 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Turning now to the art rejections, claims 8, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0145584). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Lee.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Fig. 3 and page 21 lines 9-18 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

a second power conversion section including a primary side for receiving said direct current input voltage, a secondary side isolated from said primary side for generating a power-supply voltage to be supplied to said backlight section, a detection circuit for detecting a voltage supplied to said backlight section, a feedback section for receiving the detected voltage from said detection section, for rectifying the detected voltage, and for supplying the rectified voltage to said primary side of said second power conversion section[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a detection circuit for detecting a voltage supplied to a backlight section. Moreover, the relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a feedback section for rectifying a detected voltage (supplied to a backlight section). Further, the relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a feedback section for supplying a rectified voltage to a primary side of a second power conversion section.

Rather, such sections of Lee describe a current detecting section which detects a current level of lamp tube current flowing in a fluorescent lamp and provides a current detecting signal corresponding to the detected current level to dc-to-dc converter of a first voltage converting section. (See Fig.6 and ¶ [0080].) These sections are not concerned with detecting a voltage supplied to the fluorescent lamp, are not concerned with rectifying a detected voltage supplied to the fluorescent lamp, and are not concerned with supplying a rectified voltage to the dc-to-dc converter of the first voltage converting section. Hence, the relied on sections of Lee do not disclose or suggest the features set forth in the above excerpt of claim 8.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that the relied on sections of Lee do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 8 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Claims 10 and 12-14 depend from claim 8. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Lee for at least the same reasons.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sawada (U.S. Patent No. 7,315,464). However, Sawada is not prior art.

Sawada issued from an application filed on September 30, 2004. Though Sawada claims priority from Japanese applications filed on October 3, 2003 and June 22, 2004, no benefit of the filing date of the foreign application is given for prior art purposes. (See M.P.E.P. § 706.02(f)(1), Example 3.) The prior art date of Sawada is therefore September 30, 2004.

By contrast, the present application is a national stage application under 35 U.S.C. § 371 of International Application No. PCT/JP2004/018418, filed December 3, 2004, which claims priority from Japanese Application No. P2004-145987 filed May 17, 2004. The May 17, 2004 priority date of the present application precedes the September 30, 2004 prior art date of Sawada.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Cheng (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0169465). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claim 11 depends from claim 8 and therefore is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Lee for at least the same reasons.

The relied-on sections of Cheng do not overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Lee.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections and the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e), 103(a), 112, first paragraph, and 112, second paragraph.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass

this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 15, 2009 Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Lawrence
E. Russ/
Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

1049205_1.DOC